



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,269	09/24/2003	Scott A. Van Gundy	23215-07991	6540
758	7590	11/29/2006	EXAMINER ESCALANTE, OVIDIO	
FENWICK & WEST LLP SILICON VALLEY CENTER 801 CALIFORNIA STREET MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041			ART UNIT 2614	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/671,269	VAN GUNDY, SCOTT A.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ovidio Escalante	2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 5-15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's response filed on November 6, 2006. **Claims 1-15** are now pending in the present application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Picard et al. US Patent Pub. 2004/0146147.

Regarding claim 5, Picard teaches a method for distributing voice mail messages, (abstract; fig. 2; paragraph 0014), the method comprising:

determining, at a first server, whether a second server is available, (paragraph 0048); and responsive to determining that the second server is available, (paragraph 0048); retrieving a voice mail message from the first server, (paragraphs 0014,); and sending the voice mail message to the second server, (paragraphs 0004, 0014, 0033, 0039).

Regarding claim 6, Picard, as applied to claim 5, teaches querying a configuration module for a location of the second server, (paragraphs 0014, 0033, 0039).

Regarding claim 7, Picard, as applied to claim 5, teaches responsive to determining that the second server is available;

receiving, by the second server, the voice mail message, (paragraphs 0004, 0014, 0033, 0039); and

storing, by the second server, the voice mail message, paragraphs 0004, 0014, 0033, 0039*).

4. Claims 8-10 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shaffer US Patent 6,002,751.

Regarding claim 8, Shaffer teaches an apparatus for receiving, storing and distributing voice mail messages, (abstract; fig. 3), the apparatus comprising:

a call status module, configured to determine whether a call should be transferred to voice mail, (col. 3, lines 28-50);

a call transfer module, configured to determine a call's voice mail extension and a server on which the voice mail extension resides, (col. 4, lines 23-37), wherein the server is one of a plurality of servers on which voice mail extensions reside, (col. 3, lines 28-50); and

a voice mail migration module, configured to send a voice mail message to a remote server, (col. 4, lines 46-49).

Regarding claim 9, Shaffer, as applied to claim 8, teaches the call transfer module is further configured to determine whether the server on which the voice mail extension resides is a remote server, (col. 4, lines 23-37; fig. 1, fig. 3).

Regarding claim 10, Shaffer, as applied to claim 8, teaches a storage interface module, configured to allow modules to store and retrieve data, (col. 3, line 66-col. 4, line 22).

Regarding claim 12, Shaffer, as applied to claim 8, teaches a telephony application programming interface module, configured to allow module access to data on a switch, (col. 3, lines 28-65).

Regarding claim 13, Shaffer, as applied to claim 8, teaches a configuration module, configured to provide information about remote servers, (col. 3, lines 28-65).

Regarding claim 14, Shaffer, as applied to claim 8, teaches an extension library module, configured to provide common functions that are used by modules, (col. 3, lines 28-65).

Regarding claim 15, Shaffer teaches a system for receiving, storing, and distributing voice mail messages, (abstract; figs. 1 and 3), the system comprising:

a first apparatus for receiving, storing, and distributing voice mail messages, (col. 3, lines 28-50), the first apparatus comprising:

a first call status module, configured to determine whether a first call should be transferred to voice mail, (col. 3, lines 28-50);

a first call transfer module, configured to determine a first call's voice mail extension and a first sever on which the first voice mail extension resides, (col. 4, lines 23-35), wherein the first server is one of a plurality of servers on which voice mail extensions reside, (col. 3, lines 28-50); and a first voice mail migration module, configured to send a first voice mail message to a first remote server, (col. 3, lines 28-50; fig. 3); and

a second apparatus for receiving, storing and distributing voice mail messages, (col. 5, lines 12-34), the second apparatus comprising:

a second call status module, configured to determine whether a second call should be transferred to voice mail, (col. 3, lines 28-50; fig. 3);

a second call transfer module, configured to determine a second call's voice mail extension and a second server on which the second voice mail extension resides, (col. 4, lines 24-35; fig. 3), wherein the second server is one of a plurality of servers on which voice mail extensions reside, (col. 3, lines 28-50); and

a second voice mail migration module, configured to send a second voice mail message to a second remote server, (col. 4, lines 24-38; fig. 3);

wherein the first apparatus and the second apparatus are coupled to each other, (fig 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer in view of Sherwood US Patent 6,542,584.

Regarding claim 11, Shaffer, as applied to claim 8, does not specifically teach of an encoding/decoding module configured to convert audio voice message to a data format, however

the Examiner believes that it would have been obvious if not inherent that Shaffer would have an audio encoding/decoding module since it was well known in the art for voice mail systems to take analog voice from the sending party and store the analog voice as digital data.

Nonetheless, Sherwood teaches an audio encoding/decoding module, configured to convert audio voice mail messages to a data format suitable for storage and to convert voice mail messages from this storage data format to an audio format, (col. 3, lines 26-49).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Shaffer by including an encoding/decoding module as taught by Sherwood so that messages can be stored as digital data which will thus allow less space to be occupied in the message storage.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 5-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

9. Applicant's arguments filed November 6, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 8-15, Applicant contends that Shaffer does not teach "wherein the server is one of a plurality of servers on which voice mail extensions reside" since Shafer does not disclose whether the voice mail system includes multiple servers. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Looking solely at fig. 3 and col. 3, lines 26-49, it is clear that multiple servers are included in both the remote and local systems. For example, in addition to the voice mail server, there is the PBX server and the call-processing server. Since the claims do not specify the type of

server, then since Shaffer provides for at least one of a plurality of servers, then Shaffer meets the claimed limitations.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 1-4 are allowed.

Conclusion

11. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(571) 273-7537, (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ovidio Escalante whose telephone number is 571-272-7537. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th from 6:30AM to 4:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan S. Tsang can be reached on 571-272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**OVIDIO ESCALANTE
PATENT EXAMINER**

Ovidio Escalante

Ovidio Escalante
Primary Patent Examiner
Group 2645
November 27, 2006

O.E./oe